

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The Applicant's attorney thank Examiners Dexter Tugbang and Theim Phan for the courtesy of the interview on January 11, 2006. I believe the interview was very helpful in moving the prosecution of this case forward.

Claims 1 and 25, and thus each of the claims that depend therefrom, have been amended to clarify the language in such claims. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, it is Applicant's belief that claims 1-12 and 25-35 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant's Response to the 35 C.F.R. 1.76(c) Objection of Claims 6

Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the anomaly in Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant amended claim 6 to state "The printed circuit board of claim 1, wherein the bonding is performed at sufficient temperature and for a sufficient period of time to enable full and complete curing of the resins in the insulating sublayer."

In the light of the amendment to claim 6, it is Applicants' belief that claim 6 is now of proper dependent form under 35 C.F.R. 1.76 (c). Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7,
25, 26, and 31 Over Patel

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Applicants' claims 1, 2, 7, 25, 26, and 31 as being anticipated by Patel. Claims 1 and 25 have been amended as we discussed to more clearly describe the process of forming the printed circuit board. More particularly, claims 1 and 25 have been amended to better describe the "process of bonding the conductor core to the sublayer of electrically insulating material to create a flat laminate, wherein the areas of thick conductive material are positioned adjacent to and are covered by the sublayer." Patel et al., on the other hand, applies material to "member 12 and substantially 'fills' depressed portions 18, thereby forming a pre-circuit assembly 24." As discussed, Patel et al. does not teach covering the conductive material by the sublayer. Therefore, Patel et al. does not anticipate Applicant's claims 1 and 25.

It should be noted that claims 2-12 and 26-35 depend from independent claims 1 and 25 respectively, which are discussed above, and thus contain each and every limitation of claims 1 and 25. Thus, no further comments concerning claims 2-12 and 26-35 are deemed necessary herein to be fully responsive to the Office Action dated November 10, 2005.

In light of the foregoing, it is Applicant's belief that claims 1, 2, 7, 25, 26, and 35 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the teachings of

Patel et al. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 1, 2, 7, 25, 26, and 35 is respectfully requested.

Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 9-12, 27-30, and 32-35 Over Patel in View of Bokisa

Claims 3, 4, 9-12, 27-30 and 32-35 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al. in view of Bokisa due to obviousness. As the Examiner is aware, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestions to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F. 2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As discussed in the interview with the examiner, neither Patel nor Bokisa recite claims 1 and 25 PCB that is "formed by the process...[of] bonding the conductor core to sublayer of electrically insulating material to create flat laminate, wherein the areas of thick conductive material are

positioned adjacent to and are covered by the sublayer." Therefore, claims 1 and 25 are not obvious and are patentable over Patel et al. and Bokisa.

It is believed that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been provided, as discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection to claims 3, 4, 9-12, 27-30, and 32-35 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action dated November 10, 2005. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding the foregoing, Applicant's attorney would welcome a telephonic interview with the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc A. Brockhaus, Reg. No. 40,923
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
Customer No. 30589
P.O. Box 16370
Oklahoma City, OK 73113
(405) 607-8600 - telephone
(405) 607-8686 - facsimile

Attorney for Applicant